

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/648,589	08/25/2003	Ricky W. Purcell	18614 (27839-2533)	4251	
45736 Christopher M	7590 04/12/2010 . Goff (27839)	EXAM	EXAMINER		
ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP			HELLING, KAITLYN ELIZABETH		
ONE METRO SUITE 2600	POLITAN SQUARE	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
ST. LOUIS, M	O 63102	3739			
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			04/12/2010	ELECTRONIC	

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail  $\,$  address(es):

USpatents@armstrongteasdale.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/648,589	PURCELL ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
KAITLYN E. HELLING	3739		

	KAITLYN E. HELLING	3739	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 22 March 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS AP	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.	
<ol> <li>M The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following i application in condition for allowance, (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:</li> </ol>	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing.	date of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07( Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been flied is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex- under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earmed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1: ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origithan three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
NOTICE OF APPEAL			
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi</li> </ol>	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>			
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, t         <ul> <li>(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor</li> <li>(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belowed)</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	nsideration and/or search (see NOT		cause
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet		ducing or simplifying t	ne issues for
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	porroananding number of finally rais	acted alaims	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	orresponding number of finally reje	scied ciairris.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Cor	mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).
<ol> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> </ol>			
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	owable if submitted in a separate, t	•	
7. ∑ for purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s); a) I how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected; <u>26-38</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		I be entered and an e	xplanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</li> </ol>	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
<ul> <li>12.</li></ul>	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).		
Il inde C Dunneld			

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3739

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's argument with respect to the combination of Satou, et al. and Ouellette, et al. is not persuasive. The examiner disagrees with applicant's position that the combination of Ouellette, et al. with Satou, et al. would defeat the purpose of Satou et al. The examiner would point to Ouellette, et al. as teaching that either the upper or lower strap may have one or more additional separations to form a third or more strap portions thus allowing for additional differential tensioning. The examiner does not agree with applicant's contention that a third tape portion would wrap across the outer side site of the joint. This is particularly true if applicant looks to the figures of Ouellette where the third strap portion is a part of either the upper or lower strap and thus would not wrap across the top of the joint. The examiner is unsure of the meaning of applicant's argument with respect to Satou, et al. teaching a non-contacting adhesive portion.

Continuation of 13. Other: The Amendment has been entered as directed to a mater of form not affectin ghte scope of the claim, but applicant's arguments are not pursuasive.